Date: Thu, 8 Apr 93 23:00:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #89
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 8 Apr 93   Volume 93 : Issue   89

Today's Topics:
                    2 meter phone calls? (2 msgs)
                              CW & Phone
                 CW = effective utilization? (2 msgs)
                    Remote control of ATV (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 8 Apr 93 13:31:32 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>talk in stations being gigged yet, but I agree that a strict interpretation
>of the rules could make some of the traffic there illegal, especially

i wouldn't think announcing prize winners would be a problem, but certainly
when the talk in station acts as a go between the hamfest table seller and the
incoming ham we have the specter of commercial use appear.

bill wb9ivr

Date: Thu, 8 Apr 1993 22:09:51 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!icon.rose.hp.com!greg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:
: In article <C4s7r1.HDF@icon.rose.hp.com> greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas) writes:
:
: In general, the rules say the content of amateur transmissions shall
: "be of such an unimportant nature that recourse to the public
: telecommunications service is not justified" and "No station shall
: transmit communications as an alternative to other authorized radio
: services, except as necessary to provide emergency communications."
: The latter, from Part 97.113, is pretty clear. If a cellular phone
: could provide the communications, you can't use an amateur radio
: phone patch.

Ok, let's auger down on this part. Since the Cellular network now covers every major city, most minor ones, and all the roads in between, it would seem to be illegal to use an autopatch almost anywhere in the country, except in an emergency, of course.

That doesn't seem right either. I would focus on the words "as an alternative" as operative here. To me, they are trying to prevent amateur radio from competing with the phone company, which I expect everyone would agree with. Competition would imply a regular or high volume of usage, a gray area to be sure, but something which the amateur community should be able to self-police. There are lots of things a Cell phone "could" do, but that's not the point.

Greg KD6KGW

Date: Fri, 09 Apr 1993 02:30:47 GMT
From: nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW & Phone
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK all,

Lets do this right. Starting with 160m, make that ALL CW. Then
80 ALL Phone. 40 back to being ALL CW like it used to be. Etc.
Then all the cry-babies can have their own homes.

Oh yea, computers. Well lets see.....The arguments for the no code
were that all computer types would love using uhf & up. So I guess
we could put all the digital types (othen than CW) way up yonder.

In fact, I'll take 40m, 20m and 200 khz of 10m and let the rest
be waisted on phone.

The thing that so many seem to miss is that a hell of a lot of amateurs all over the world ENJOY cw. This whole thing is a hobby. It's supposed to be fun. There is plenty of room for all. If you can't see that, and if you don't enjoy it, then maybe you would be better off playing golf etc.

So why not lighten up and enjoy life. You can even cheat and look up the call of someone you "worked" and get away with it. After all, it's you wall. If you want to do things that way, I guess it's up to you.

Have fun, and try QRP.

"Ron", KU7Y

Date: Thu, 8 Apr 1993 17:49:44 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: CW = effective utilization?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:
>
>>Funny, one note says the CW bands are dying, another says they're
>>teeming. The real question is:
>>   Since when is it the responsibility of the FCC and its
>>   licensing structure to ensure effective utilization of our
>>   spectrum?

>Try reading the Communications Act of 1934 sometime. That requirement, among
>others, is included in the text. Because of the public nature of radio, the
>FCC has stewardship requirements that are quite different from most other
>agencies.

True, the FCC is supposed to ensure effective utilization of spectrum overall. In the context of this argument, I was referring solely to the amateur spectrum. If you believe that the FCC is supposed to micro-manage utilization down to portions of services, i.e. a piece of the amateur service, then I suggest the FCC is already remiss in its duties. CW is hardly the *most* effective utilization of the amateur bands given the statement of purpose for the amateur service as given in Section 97.1:

    a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur
       service to the public as a voluntary noncommercial

communication service, particularly with respect to providing emergency communication.

b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art.

c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur radio service through rules which provide for advancing skills in both the communication and technical phases of the art.

d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.

e) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to enhance international goodwill.

In which of the above clauses does CW exceed all other modes of communication?

Besides, there is something about these arguments that really gets my goat. The CW advocates spout the virtues of CW such as the ability to cut through the QRM and QRN, its narrow bandwidth, the availability of equipment, etc. If it's so great, why does it need exclusive allocations? What more incentive is necessary than being a great mode? Why don't RTTY and Packet get their own exclusive band segments? What are the principles being used to decide what gets exclusive allocation and what doesn't? What principles are being used to decide that 5, 13, and 20 WPM proficiency at morse code are relevant and appropriate versus 1 WPM? Or are the decisions arbitrary and capricious.

Given modern filters, an argument could be made that the separation of the CW and Phone allocations only decreases potential utilization as one should be able to easily intersperse CW and Phone conversations.

Please note, I'm not trying to bash CW, I'm just trying to understand why it gets preferential treatment and is forced down everyone's throat. Aside from the ITU treaty which only requires knowledge of CW and no stated speed requirements, how are 5, 13, and 20 WPM of morse code justified as licensing requirements?

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 9 Apr 93 02:45:44 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!unixhub!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW = effective utilization?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:
>Besides, there is something about these arguments that really gets my goat.
>The CW advocates spout the virtues of CW such as the ability to cut through
>the QRM and QRN, its narrow bandwidth, the availability of equipment, etc.
>If it's so great, why does it need exclusive allocations?

We've been over this before. There are two basic reasons, one techincal, and
one nontechnical. First, the technical reason is that narrowband modes are
more susceptible to cross interference than wideband modes. The nontechnical
reason is to encourage regular use of a mode which requires more operator
skill.

> What more
>incentive is necessary than being a great mode? Why don't RTTY and Packet
>get their own exclusive band segments?

You can plug them in, and they work; little skill is required. Packet will
work even in the presence of wideband interference.

> What principles
>are being used to decide that 5, 13, and 20 WPM proficiency at morse code
>are relevant and appropriate versus 1 WPM? Or are the decisions arbitrary
>and capricious.

The 5, 13, and 20 wpm proficiencies reflect long understood plateaus of
learning for CW skill. 5 wpm is basic character mapping, 13 wpm is true
character recognition, and 20 wpm is word recognition. From a utility
standpoint, 5 wpm is good for repeater cw id'ers, and little else. 13 wpm
gives you a conversational level, and if you use it enough, you will get to
20 wpm within about a year or so.

>Please note, I'm not trying to bash CW, I'm just trying to understand why
>it gets preferential treatment and is forced down everyone's throat. Aside
>from the ITU treaty which only requires knowledge of CW and no stated speed
>requirements, how are 5, 13, and 20 WPM of morse code justified as
>licensing requirements?

Date: 8 Apr 93 19:00:02 GMT
From: olivea!gossip.pyramid.com!pyramid!pyrtech.mis.pyramid.com!andrem@ames.arpa
Subject: Remote control of ATV

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I'm posting this to rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy
as I'm not sure which group would be best. My aplogies if it's
inappropriate for either group.

I have a question regarding the ATV transmissions and whether or not
they can legally be controlled remotely. I'm a member of the
Nor-Cal Shelby club, and am hoping to set up an in-car camera at
one of the upcoming open-track events. I will not be the driver of
the car, and was wondering if it would be legal to have a camera
broadcasting from a car that didn't have a licensed amateur in it as
long as I retained control remotely.

The idea is to give those of us hanging out in the paddock area a
view of what's going on out on the track.   This would be just for
fun, and in no way involved in the actual business of running of the
event. I would like to set up a control link so that I could switch
the transmitter on-and-off via 220 or 440. Is there any legal way to
do this? Or do I need to make sure there's a licensed ham both in
the car and at the receiving end?

This thing's gonna be harder to pull off if I have to get some
drivers licensed or make them carry a passenger if we're going
to transmit. Although it could be more fun for a few hams who
would get to go along for the ride...

If anyone could point me to ther relevant portion of the rules
and help provide some interpretation, it would be a great help.

Thanks

+---+
| Andre Molyneux   KA7WVV   "Insert your favorite disclaimer here" |
+---+-------------------------------+
-=-------- PYRAMID TECHNOLOGY CORP	Internet:
---===------ 3860 N. First Street	andrem@pyramid.com
----=====---- San Jose, CA 95134	Packet:
----------------- (408) 428-8229	ka7wvv@n0ary.#nocal.ca.usa.na
+---+-------------------------------+

Date: Thu, 8 Apr 1993 20:54:05 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srgenprp!frankb@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Andre Molyneux (andrem@pyrtech.mis.pyramid.com) wrote:
&
& I have a question regarding the ATV transmissions and whether or not
& they can legally be controlled remotely. I'm a member of the
& Nor-Cal Shelby club, and am hoping to set up an in-car camera at
& one of the upcoming open-track events. I will not be the driver of
& the car, and was wondering if it would be legal to have a camera
& broadcasting from a car that didn't have a licensed amateur in it as
& long as I retained control remotely.

This sounds legal. Hams put cameras in RC airplanes and that is legal.
The driver won't be in control of the camera, you are.

--
Frank Ball   1UR-M   frankb@sad.hp.com   (707) 794-4168 work,
Hewlett Packard   (707) 794-3844 fax, (707) 538-3693 home
1212 Valley House Drive   IT175, XT350, Seca 750, '62 F-100, PL510
Rohnert Park CA 94928-4999 KC6WUG, LAW, AMA, Dod #7566, I'm the NRA.

Date: 8 Apr 1993 20:17:08 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> The idea is to give those of us hanging out in the paddock area a
> view of what's going on out on the track.   This would be just for
> fun, and in no way involved in the actual business of running of the
> event. I would like to set up a control link so that I could switch
> the transmitter on-and-off via 220 or 440.

Sure, it's legal. Since you are placing a way to turn off the transmitter
via the control link, then you are using "remote control" of the station.

  97.109 Station Control (b). When a station is being remotely controlled,
  the control operator must be present at the control point. Any station may
  be remotely controlled.

Make sure you meet the rules for remote control though:

  97.213 Remote Control of a station

  An amateur station may be remotely controlled where:

  (a) There is a radio or wireline control link between the control point and
  the station sufficient for the control operator to perform his/her duties.
  If radio, the control link must use an auxiliarly station.

(b) Provisions are incorporated to limit transmission by the station to a period of no more than 3 minutes in the event of malfunction of the control link.

(c) A photocopy of the station license and a label with the name, address, and telephone number of the station licensee and at least one designated control operator is posted in a conspicuous place at the station location.

Now for auxiliary stations (your control link):
97.201 Auxiliary Station.
(a) Any amateur station licensed to a holder of a [Technican or higher] operator license may be an auxilliary station. A holder of a [Technician or higher] operator license may be the control operator of an auxiliary station, subect to the priveleges of the class of operator license held.

(b) An auxiliary station may transmit only on the 1.25m and shorter wavelengths, except the 431-433 MHz and 435-438 MHz segments.

(c) Where an auxiliary station causes harmfull interference to another auxiliary station, the licensees are equally and fully responsible for resolving the interference unless one station's operation is recommended by a frequency coordinator and the other station's is not. In that case, the licensee of the non-coordinated station has primary responsibility to resolve the interference.

(d) An auxiliary station may be automatically controlled only when it is part of a system that includes a repeater that is also being automatically controlled. [I have never understood the reason for this rule]

(e) An auxiliary station may transmit one-way communications.

Date: 9 Apr 1993 00:50:19 GMT
From: sun-barr!west.West.Sun.COM!l1-a!flloyd@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C56nE5.11I@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>
frankb@sad.hp.com (Frank Ball) writes:
>
>This sounds legal. Hams put cameras in RC airplanes and that is legal.
>The driver won't be in control of the camera, you are.
>

But BE CAREFUL! If the driver swoops down on some nude sunbathers,
POOF! there goes your license!

By the way, what frequency is it on? :-)

-fred

--
[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ   Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM]
[Sun Microsystems,   Southwest Area Solaris Transition Manager]
[Phoenix, AZ   (602) 224-3517]

Date: 8 Apr 93 19:37:33 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!mei.mon@hplabs.hp.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C5119v.5rv@fmsystm.ncoast.org>,
<Apr06.153832.73850@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<paulf.734123152@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In <paulf.734123152@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU> paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul
Flaherty) writes:

>We've had more than a decade of interaction
>between computing and radio, and yet the CW bands are still well populated.

Indeed! Maybe the OFs should be required to learn MORE than just the basics
of packet, spread-spectrum and the like! ;-)

A little more time with the old text books instead of pounding brass
would help. ;-)

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB, EE and "no-code" TECH!

Temporarily using our companies corporate account. Many other
individuals use it as well. Please state in any E-mail follow-ups
that the mail is intended for me so as to avoid confusion. Thanks.

Marquette Electronics, Inc. account information follows...

--
mei.mon@mixcom.com

Date: Thu, 8 Apr 1993 15:59:49 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!
dts@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.733965941@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Apr7.140414.15415@ke4zv.uucp>, <paulf.734203293@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: No-code issue

In article <paulf.734203293@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
|> gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:
|>
|> >At 3 kHz spacing, and ignoring frequency reuse due to propagation, there's
|> >room for 808 two way QSOs on the present HF phone segments.
|>
|> You're neglecting propagation in your analysis. E layer absorption and F
|> layer refraction restrict the number of channels available at any one time.
|> Moreover, the largest bands (10 and 75/80) are open for the least amount of
|> time.

The original poster SPECIFICALLY said that he was ignoring the propagation issues to make a comparison. You are ignoring aspects of that too. First off, it's the D layer that does the absorbing. The E layer is generally responsible for short skip, when active. 80 meters is used in the morning and evening before the propagation gets good for DX for LOCAL communications. At that time of the day frequency re-use is maximized on that band. The same is true for 40 meters. The upper bands are FAR from useless at night. 10 meters becomes an ideal band for local communications on ground wave at night. 12 meters follows as well. Again frequency re-use is possible.

With bands that ARE open for F2 propagation, frequency re-use is entirely possible when the stations in 2 or more QSOs are arranged such that all are in the skip zones of the opposite QSOs.

|>
|> > If we opened
|> >up the CW segments, there'd be room for another 375 QSOs on SSB, a 46%
|> >increase.
|>
|> Here, you've omitted the fact that half of those "cw" segments are used for
|> RTTY. Also, the high 50 kHz of the 40m "cw" allocation is useless for SSB,
|> given the broadcasters. Finally, SSB is not allowed on 30m by international
|> agreement.

Actually RTTY, AMTOR, PACTOR, Clover and HF Packet typically call squeeze into a

tiny portion of the "CW" allocation. Note that these are actually "non-voice" allocations. Except during contests, the CW ops are left LOTS of space by the digital mode folks. But then during CW contests, the digital mode folks can't find space in the digital subbands due to all the CW.

|>
|> >I also find this hard to stomach. With stylized contacts, stock CW
|> >abbreviations can compress the content to near phone levels, but in
|> >actual conversations that attempt to exchange ideas, CW falls down
|> >badly. Even with stylized traffic, I was traffic manager for the
|> >Ky traffic nets in the late 1960s, the phone nets always passed
|> >much more traffic than the CW nets in their allotted times.
|> >120 WPM speech just *is* faster than 13 WPM CW. If you don't have
|> >much to say, then either is sufficient, but hopefully amateur contacts
|> >aren't all content free.
|>
|> Of course it's faster, but that isn't relevant. The question is binary, "is
|> this mode conversational or not?" as far as most ham QSOs go. 13 wpm is pretty
|> much a minimum for conversation, but it is in fact conversational. I'd add
|> that traffic handling is very much a minority activity, which makes the
|> comparison irrelevant on its face.

Do you handle traffic? It does not sound like it. Traffic handling forms the basis of good operating practice for emergency message handling. With the RACES net I operate, the traffic handlers invariably copy important traffic on the first try, those who do not handle traffic take 4 or 5 fills to the message, or more. Traffic handling efficiency is a very good measure of the amount of information that can be passed on a channel. CW has no place in our RACES operations since it is inefficient. HF SSB and VHF FM are the modes used.

|>
|> Let's also not forget that those 450 SSB channels must be shared not only
|> among US hams, but everyone in the world...
|>
|> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny, not victims
|> ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | of fate." -- Ronald Reagan

--

Daniel Senie   Internet: dts@banyan.com
Banyan Systems, Inc.   Compuserve: 74176,1347
508-898-1188   Packet Radio: N1JEB@WA1PHY.MA

Date: Thu, 08 Apr 1993 16:12:41 GMT
From: yuma!galen@purdue.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Apr06.153832.73850@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<paulf.734123152@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <1993Apr7.141825.15538@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <1993Apr7.141825.15538@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>In article <paulf.734123152@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>>Funny thing, obsolescence. AM and SSB have been around for decades, and CW
>>is still at least as popular. We've had more than a decade of interaction
>>between computing and radio, and yet the CW bands are still well populated.
>Yep, takes a loooonnng time for the OFs to die off. :-)
>I'm sure we'd still hear spark transmissions if they were allowed.
>It's like working DX, some people just want to do things the hard
>way. I would note that the traffic nets, feeble as they are today,
>are moving in the direction of computers. We used open reel tape
>recorders and speech to move traffic quickly back in the 1960s.
>That system is still faster than the computer systems of today,
>but that's more because of regulations than capability.
>I noted with some frustration in the "World Above 50 MHz" column
>that computer assisted contacts won't be counted for record status.
>Thus the weak signal boys have become as stylized and ossified as
>the rest of the CW forever crowd. Weak signal users can no longer
>claim they are advancing the art when they refuse to recognize the
>greatest improvenent in the art available to them.
>Gary

What he said!
Galen Watts, KF0YJ

Date: (null)
From: (null)
Yes, it gets my goat too when I hear the cw requirements justified in terms
of "filtering the CB types", or "traditions", especially when there are sound
technical justifications.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "...but I thought I was voting for 'Bill the Cat'!"
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- A Confused Voter

Date: 9 Apr 1993 05:56:53 GMT
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <186072@pyramid.pyramid.com>, <C56nE5.11I@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>,
<1q2h8bINNdnf@west.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: Remote control of ATV

flloyd@l1-a.West.Sun.COM (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:
>But BE CAREFUL! If the driver swoops down on some nude sunbathers,
>POOF! there goes your license!

Not at all!   Nudity by itself isn't obscene, indecent, or profane
in any civilized community.

Of course, Fred's from Phoenix....
          - Brian

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #89
****